

# HERITAGE COMMISSION

## *Draft Minutes*

*September 3, 2009*

The Heritage Commission held its regular monthly meeting in the City Council Chambers at 37 Green Street, Concord, New Hampshire, on Thursday, September 3, 2009, at 4:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Seating of Alternates:

Chairperson Donovan called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.

Present at the meeting were Dr. Black, Robert V. Johnson, II, Chairperson Philip Donovan, James McConaha, Vice Chair Frederick Richards, Bryant Tolles, and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen. City Planner Douglas Woodward and Administrative Specialist Donna Muir were also present. Absent from the meeting were Committee Members Carol Durgy Brooks, Gerard Blanchette, and Marilyn Fraser.

Chairperson Donovan elevated the alternate members to full member status for the meeting.

2. Minutes of the July 9, 2009 meeting:

The Commission considered the minutes of the July 9, 2009, Heritage Commission meeting. A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to accept the minutes as presented, and Mr. McConaha seconded the motion. Chairperson Donovan asked if there was any discussion regarding the minutes. The motion accepting the minutes of the July 9, 2009, meeting passed unanimously.

3. New Business:

*a. Historic District Application by the Concordia Lutheran Church at 215 North Main Street*

Representatives of Concordia Lutheran Church attending the meeting included Bill Hauser, Board Chair; Phil Joseph, President; Pastor Jonathan Hopkins; and Joann Willemsen, church member.

*i. Public hearing*

Chairperson Donovan opened the public hearing, welcomed the Church representatives, and asked that they provide an overview of their request to the Commission.

Mr. Hauser stated that Concordia Lutheran Church submitted an application to the Commission describing the windows to be replaced on the parsonage building. He explained that the parsonage had been moved to its current site but was built in the 1930s or 1940s. The windows have never been replaced and are in great disrepair. The windows do not open or close, and are not energy efficient. The Church has looked into repairing the windows, but would prefer to replace them. In the application package, Mr. Hauser included a specification sheet from Pella Windows, which outlined the various types of windows that could be used.

Chairperson Donovan opened the floor for discussion. Vice Chair Richards asked if there was a way to pinpoint the age of the building. Ms. Hengen stated that the church should have been

included in the 1988 Architectural Survey. Mr. Woodward left the meeting to obtain a copy of the survey.

Chairperson Donovan asked what the current windows are, and Mr. Hauser stated the windows are 8 over 8 wooden sash windows, and the exterior of the building is sided. Mr. Hauser also stated that the church historical records are sketchy. Ms. Hengen asked whether the trim around the windows was removed when the siding was installed. Mr. McConaha asked whether the windows are original to the house and if the deterioration is due to the age of the windows. Mr. Hauser stated that the sash ropes have been replaced, the windows don't sit properly, and a stick is needed to hold the windows open.

Dr. Black asked what the cost for replacement versus repair of the windows would be. Mr. Hauser stated that each window would cost \$260.00 to replace and \$140.00 to repair; however, repairing the windows would only be a temporary fix and not make the windows more energy efficient.

Mr. McConaha stated that there were a number of good window rehabilitation specialists in New Hampshire and wanted to know if the Church had contacted any of them. Mr. Hauser stated that he didn't know, but could check with the person at the Church who did the research.

Vice Chair Richards said that the windows are an important part of keeping the integrity of the building's historic presence. He doesn't feel that he has enough information and asked whether the Church would be able to bring in a sample of the new windows.

Ms. Hengen asked why the Church was considering changing the windows from 8 over 8 to 6 over 6. Mr. Hauser stated that it was basically a cost factor, as the 6 over 6 windows are standard and less expensive. Ms. Hengen also asked what influenced the choice of the muntins between the glass as opposed to on the interior and exterior of the glass. Mr. Hauser stated that he believed the choice was made due to the ease of maintenance and the cost factor. Mr. McConaha asked whether the interior of the new windows were wood, with Duraclad on the exterior. Mr. Hauser thought they were durable wood framed windows.

Mr. Tolles asked that if the windows were to be rehabbed, what would be done with them. Mr. Hauser stated that the glass would be reglazed and the sashes repaired. This would be a labor intensive project without any energy benefits received.

Mr. Woodward returned to the meeting with the 1988 Architectural Survey, and Ms. Hengen stated that according to the survey, the parsonage was built in 1959. Pastor Jonathan stated that the building was moved in 1959, not built in that year.

Vice Chair Richards felt that it was necessary to balance energy savings with preserving the historic integrity of the building and feels that at the very least the windows should be 8 over 8.

Mr. Hauser asked the Commission what the process and deliberation time would be. Chairperson Donovan stated that the Commission would have a response by the end of the meeting.

Chairperson Donovan called a brief recess.

Ms. Hengen stated that the vinyl siding had been added in 1988, and at some point thereafter, the sunroom was added.

Chairperson Donovan asked if there were more comments regarding the application by Concordia Lutheran Church.

Mr. McConaha stated that the difference in the cost of rehabbing as opposed to replacing the windows was approximately \$1,500.00. He also asked whether the replacement windows would be tinted or clear. Mr. Hauser stated that the windows would be clear with a single sheet of glass on the outside. Mr. McConaha stated that the single sheet of glass on the outside was a dead giveaway that the window is a replacement.

Mr. Hauser stated that he was under the impression that the application submitted by the Church was complete. He asked whether the Commission would approve the application for replacement windows if the Church agreed to install 8 over 8 windows instead of the 6 over 6 proposed, without seeing a sample. Pastor Jonathan stated that requiring 8 over 8 windows would hurt the Church financially. Ms. Hengen asked what the cost difference would be. Pastor Jonathan stated that there would be a difference of approximately \$1,200.00.

*ii. Deliberation and Action on the Application*

Chairperson Donovan closed the public hearing at 5:07 p.m., and the Commission began its deliberations.

Mr. Johnson stated that he understands where the Church is coming from financially, and he is also in favor of smaller windows, and believes that the 8 over 8 windows are more consistent for the historic district.

Ms. Hengen stated that she noted one other item about the proposal, which was that the windows were part of an all-in-one package, and the actual opening in the window would be shrunk with the new windows. She said that the building has already undergone a number of significant changes and that it is not one of the more historically significant buildings within the district. She did feel that the loss of the exterior muntins would make a difference with the loss of shadow lines.

Chairperson Donovan stated that the significant time period for the buildings within the Historic District dated from the 1750s through the 1880s, and that the parsonage building was an early 20<sup>th</sup> century revival house which was moved here, thus making it less significant.

Dr. Black suggested that the Church could save money by rehabbing the windows. Ms. Hengen stated that the quality of the wood of the current windows is better than what the quality would be like on the replacement windows. She also said that the new replacement windows do not hold up as well as windows that are subject to a good quality rehabilitation process.

Mr. McConaha agreed with Ms. Hengen. He feels that putting good storm windows over the rehabbed windows would be helpful. He doesn't have an issue with whether the Church uses 6 over 6 or 8 over 8 replacement windows, as most of the important historical features had been covered up or removed in the past. Ms. Hengen asked how many windows were scheduled to be replaced. Mr. Hauser answered 16, but only five windows face toward North Main Street. The

garage obscures most of the other windows from view from the street and only the attic window is truly visible. Ms. Hengen stated that she is comfortable with having the windows replaced, but would like the applicants to look at rehabbing again.

Ms. Hengen made a motion to approve the application to replace the windows with either all the 6 over 6 or 8 over 8 replacement windows. However, the five front windows should have the “simulated-divided-light-with-spacer” as shown in the third selection on page nine of the Pella Windows and Patio Doors specification sheet. Mr. McConaha seconded the motion.

Chairperson Donovan asked if there was any further discussion. Vice Chairperson Richards felt it was a sensible compromise to request this for the five windows on the front façade. He also suggested that the Commission provide an option for the Church to rehab the windows to conserve the original windows. He suggested that the Church take advantage of the expertise of the Commission and rehab experts within the state. Mr. Richards suggested that the five front windows be replaced with true divided lights, and then he withdrew his suggestion. Mr. McConaha suggested that the front five windows be divided light with spacers in between the glass. Mr. Tolles asked Ms. Hengen what she suggested for the side elevations. She stated that the side elevation cannot be seen easily from the street; therefore she didn’t feel they needed to have the more expensive window replacement option. Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Hengen to which of the specifications she was referring, to which she replied that it was the “simulated-divided-light-with-spacer” as shown in the third selection on page nine of the Pella Windows and Patio Doors specification sheet. Ms. Hengen asked if the Certificate of Approval requires the Commission to outline their thinking on the form. Mr. Woodward explained that the Certificate of Approval requires a description of any conditions of approval or reasons for disapproval.

Ms. Hengen stated that she would like to amend her original motion to read that the Heritage Commission is not requesting that the “simulated-divided-light-with-spacer” be required on the side elevations, because the side elevations have already undergone changes. The windows on the back of the house are not visible, or only minimally so from the street, so that the Commission would not require the “simulated-divided-light-with-spacer”. Furthermore, this part of the building was moved to the site in 1959, and dates from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, and thus is neither representative of the other significant buildings in the District, and it is not within the Historic District’s period of significance. Vice Chairperson Richards seconded the motion. Chairperson Donovan asked if there was any further discussion. Mr. Johnson stated that there was no discussion on the costs of the replacement windows as opposed to the rehab of the windows. He didn’t feel that the house should be bastardized further with different windows on the side and back. Ms. Hengen felt that there was no overall public benefit to requiring the more expensive windows on the side and rear facades. Mr. Johnson asked whether it was more expensive to have the muntins on the outside of the windows. He really believes that the windows should all be the same. Mr. McConaha agreed with the motion but added a strong recommendation or caveat that all the windows be the same. Mr. Johnson asked whether Ms. Hengen would change her amended motion. She stated that she would prefer to have a list of recommendations from the Commission rather than amend her amended motion. Chairperson Donovan stated that the applicant was willing to move from 6 over 6 windows to 8 over 8 for all the replacement windows. He also stated that the Commission needs to be sensitive of the cost to the Church as well. Chairman Donovan reiterated that the building does not have the same historical significance as some of the other buildings with the Historic District. Vice Chairperson Richards asked if the motion was precluding the Church from rehabbing the windows and adding good quality to the building. Chairperson Donovan asked that a vote on the amended motion be taken. The vote was six in favor and one opposed. The motion carried.

Mr. Johnson explained that he felt it was important that all the windows be the same and therefore felt it was necessary to vote in the negative.

Vice Chair Richards asked if the City had procedures in place to follow-up to ensure that the wishes of the Heritage Commission were followed. Mr. Woodward stated that the Church would need to obtain permits, which are tracked in a city-wide software program, in which all involved departments must sign off. In order for this not to fall through the cracks, Mr. Woodward would calendar it for follow-up.

Mr. Woodward stated that next month the Heritage Commission would be reviewing an application for tree removal at 11 Horseshoe Lane, located within the Historic District. Mr. Johnson questioned whether notification is made to the individuals and organizations within the Historic District; Mr. Woodward answered in the affirmative.

*b. Concord School District Consolidation*

Chairperson Donovan stated that Mr. McConaha has been participating with the Concord School District's task force, which is looking at rehabilitation versus new construction of the Kimball, Broken Ground, and Morrill school buildings. Mr. McConaha explained that the School District has hired an architect and is in the process of obtaining bonds. He also stated that his involvement has been as an individual and not as a member of the Heritage Commission. He proposes that the Heritage Commission weigh in, identify, and articulate the historic significance of the buildings, and that a subcommittee of the Heritage Commission be formed to come up with a proposal. Mr. Johnson stated that the Concord School District appears to be moving the process forward quickly, and that the Heritage Commission should take a stand.

Mr. Woodward stated that the Certified Local Government Grant will allow the Heritage Commission to review the buildings and would also provide for good public education opportunities if any of the school buildings are eligible for placement on the National Historic Register. Mr. Woodward stated that he has been reaching out to the School District with reference to the Certified Local Government Grant to seek their cooperation in gaining access to the buildings and securing copies of plans.

Mr. McConaha stated that if the Commission receives the Certified Local Government Grant then that would offer a setting for the Commission to proceed; however, he feels that the Commission should reiterate that Concord is a community that still maintains school buildings that are important assets that need to be preserved. He also feels that it is important to inform the School District and the City Council of the Commission's position. He stated that the first step could be to designate the buildings as landmark buildings and then apply for designation from the National Historic Register.

Ms. Hengen stated her appreciation to Mr. McConaha for his attendance at the school meetings. She stated that the Kimball and Morrill buildings are different from the other school buildings, as the plans are to reuse the site, however, the others are slated to be consolidated and the existing buildings will become vacant. She also stated that it is not appropriate for the Heritage Commission to be involved in the educational issues surrounding the School District's plans. She asked how the Commission could get word out to the community about the Certified Local Government Grant and about the Commission's feelings about the school buildings. She asked

whether the Commission was likely to obtain the grant. Vice Chair Richards responded that we are likely to get the grant, but not the full amount requested.

Ms. Hengen stated that the plans for the October School District meeting include showing the public the proposed new designs and receiving comments thereon. She feels that the timing for the Heritage Commission's involvement is right.

Mr. McConaha said that at the last task force meeting, the architect seemed to feel that the Morrill building was to be demolished and Mr. McConaha questioned whether the decision had already been made.

Dr. Black asked how the Heritage Commission could intervene at this point. Mr. McConaha stated that the Commission could attend the meetings, but that it was important that the Commission decide what role they would plan and to create a consistent message. Dr. Black stated that the Heritage Commission should make a proposal to the City Council and the School Board.

Chairperson Donovan said that the Heritage Commission needs to step up and be heard. So far the issues have been educational, but now they are architectural. He thinks it is important that the School District be made aware of the Commission's stand, and he feels that the Heritage Commission should be part of the discussions. Mr. Johnson suggested that the City Council could pass a resolution to support saving the buildings. Ms. Hengen suggested that the Heritage Commission could be a consulting party to the federal and state historic review process and that the Heritage Commission could write a letter to the NH Division of Historic Resources (NHDHR) to formalize the Commission's involvement. Ms. Hengen suggested that a formal letter from the Commission be sent to the NHDHR, and that the letter could then be reformatted as a letter to the school board, then again be reformatted as a "My Turn" piece in the Concord Monitor. Mr. Johnson suggested the same letter be reformatted as a resolution to the City Council.

Chairperson Donovan asked which of the Heritage Commission members would be willing to work on this subcommittee to preserve the buildings. Mr. Johnson suggested that the entire Heritage Commission get together sooner than the regularly scheduled monthly meeting. Chairperson Donovan stated that there was a need to move quickly and asked for volunteers for the subcommittee. Mr. McConaha and Chairperson Donovan agreed to serve on the subcommittee. Ms. Hengen stated that she would be available to review the letters, but was unable to be on the subcommittee. Vice Chair Richards stated that he would also be able to review the letters, but as a parent of students in both Kimball and Walker Schools, he had divided loyalties. He also doesn't want the Heritage Commission to be seen as obstructionists. Mr. McConaha feels that the Commission would be viewed as advocates. Chairperson Donovan agreed with both Messrs. McConaha and Richards, in that the Commission has not been involved with the educational issues surrounding the schools, but now needs to advocate for the buildings. He also stated that the Commission needs to stick with the mission of the Heritage Commission. Ms. Hengen stated that Section 106 advises that all feasible options need to be looked at, and that the Heritage Commission would be able to assist with that. Chairperson Donovan stated that the subcommittee would keep the entire Heritage Commission informed of its activities.

4. Old Business:

Heritage Commission Sign Program:

Chairperson Donovan stated that the sign application for 82-84 North State Street has been approved.

Certified Local Government Grant:

Vice Chair Richards stated that the Division of Historic Resources wants to fund the Commission's grant request, but they probably wouldn't be able to fund the entire \$25,000. DHR suggested that Mr. Woodward facilitate a meeting with the School District, the NH Department of Education, the NHDHR, and the Heritage Commission to explain the grant proposal. He stated that the Commission could probably get some matching funds. Mr. McConaha stated that if Section 106 kicks in, the School District may have to pay for all of the surveys.

Isaac Hill Monument:

Mr. Johnson stated that he believes the monument should be placed on North Main Street, according to his research.

Demolition Review Subcommittee:

Vice Chair Richards stated that a barn on Merrimack Street in Penacook is slated for demolition. The barn is more of a carriage house located behind the house and is not visible from the street. He also stated that the building has long ago lost its architectural significance.

Barney's Flower Shop on Route 3 in Penacook is also slated for demolition. According to Vice Chair Richards, the house is not included in the demolition, just the nursery buildings. Mr. Johnson stated that he had looked at the buildings and felt that if the house wasn't included in the demolition then all of the other buildings could be demolished.

Ms. Hengen stated that she would like to view both properties before coming to a decision.

Mr. Johnson asked what had happened to the proposed demolition of 23 Bradley Street. Vice Chair Richards said that the demolition had been signed off on officially, but the owner was still interested in saving the building. He and Steve Bedard walked through the building, which used to be a hatter's shop on North Main Street, and found that the building was not structurally sound and restoration would be very expensive. Ms. Hengen stated that Steve Bedard said the building didn't have historical integrity.

There being no further business or discussion. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

Donna Muir  
Administrative Specialist  
Planning Division